



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,662	05/03/2001	Sandeep K. Singhal	6020.0200	7321
34415	7590	08/26/2005	EXAMINER	
FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			CASIANO, ANGEL L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2182	

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/848,662	SINGHAL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Angel L. Casiano	2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 August 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Response to Amendment

The present Office action is in response to communication dated 26 May 2005.

Claims 1-37 are pending.

Drawings

1. Previous Objection to the Drawings has been overcome with the submission of the present Amendment.

Specification

2. Previous Objection to the Abstract has been overcome with the new submission included in the present communication.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 19 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. These claims recite, “wherein said control server is co-located with a core server that provides services as users of devices roam through the environment” (emphasis added). Examiner respectfully submits that the cited limitation is unclear.

6. Based on Examiner's interpretation of the claim language, the following basis of rejection is presented (see below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaid [US 2002/0091843 A1] in view of Brabenac [US 2002/0083351 A1].

Regarding claim 1, Vaid teaches system (see Abstract) for providing a *network adapter* (see Figure 1, "108") for one or more access points in a local area network environment (see [0027] and [0035]). The reference also includes means for connecting said one or more access points to a *wired* network and means for connecting said one or more access points to a *wireless* network (see [0004], [0023]). In addition, Vaid teaches means for enforcing a *managed network* environment (see [0044]). Vaid also teaches means for communicating with a network control server (see Figure 1).

However, the reference does not explicitly teach, "enforcing a managed network environment, including at least one of filtering and rewriting data packets", as claimed. Brabenac teaches a network adapter (see Figure 2, "150") to filter packets received from

the network (Id., “160”). At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to combine the cited disclosures in order to implement a system in which the network adapter will send to a host computer only packets that meet certain criteria, as taught by Brabenac. This would prevent unwanted messages from using the system’s resources (see Brabenac, [0026]).

As for claim 2, Vaid teaches a wireline network interface (see *port*, [0023]).

As for claim 3, Vaid teaches a wireless network interface (see *wireless connection type*, [0023]).

As for claim 4, Vaid teaches the wireless network interface coupled to a wireless access point (see [0023]; Figure 1).

As for claim 5, Vaid teaches a wireless access point as comprising an 802.11 type (see *IEEE 802.11*, [0022]).

As for claim 6, Vaid teaches a wireless access point as comprising a Bluetooth type (see [0022]).

As for claim 7, Vaid teaches communication using a Local Area Network (LAN) port (see [0027]).

As for claims 8 and 9, Vaid teaches enforcing a managing network, environment, including an IP stack (see Abstract). A Mobile IP Foreign Agent is an example of the type of IP protocol stack that could be maintained by the system as disclosed by Vaid.

As for claim 10, Vaid teaches detecting and handling packets corresponding to a plurality of network services (see *service provider*, Abstract).

As for claim 11, Vaid teaches coordination software (see *operation*, [0033]).

As for claim 12, Vaid teaches wireline interfaces (see *wired connection*, [0023]).

As for claim 13, Vaid teaches wireline interfaces (see *wireless connection type*, [0023]).

As for claim 14, Vaid teaches a switch as part of the system (see [0025]).

As for claims 15 and 16, Vaid teaches a switch programmed to forward packets (see *direct data through the network*, [0025]).

As for claim 17, Vaid teaches wireless clients forwarding packets to the network adapter (see [0007]).

As for claims 18-20, Vaid teaches (see [0022]) different standards for allowing the network control server (see “102”) to communicate. However, Vaid does not explicitly recite the *network control server* as being “co-located” with the network adapter, a core server or a routing coordinator. Regarding this limitation, Brabenac teaches a network adapter for accessing a server (see [0031]) and communication over a wireless link (see [0036]). Accordingly, this would allow for users to “roam” while still providing services. It would have been obvious to combine these disclosures at the time of the invention for the reasons stated above.

As per claim 21, the network adapter disclosed by Vaid includes a special purpose computing machine (see Figure 3).

As per claim 22, Vaid teaches software stored within access points (see [0034]).

As for claim 23, Vaid does not explicitly teach a network control server as being “distributed” over a wired network, as claimed. Vaid teaches (see [0023]) different standards for allowing the network control server to communicate over a wired network (example, USB). Therefore, it would have been obvious to distribute the network control server, depending on the communication standard selected by the user for wired communication, which is expressly disclosed by Vaid.

As for claim 24, Vaid teaches the network adapter (see Figure 3, “300”) as connectable to access point. In addition, the reference teaches communication in a LAN (see [0035]).

As for claim 25, Vaid teaches ability to connect to other networks (See [0028]).

As for claim 26, the combination of references does not explicitly recite the network adapter as being “co-located” with a Handoff Management Point, Home Address Masquerader or a Foreign Address Masquerader. However, the combination (see Vaid) teaches (see [0022]) different standards for allowing the network adapter (see “102”) to communicate. It would have been obvious to co-locate the network adapter with different devices, depending on the communication standard selected by the user.

Regarding claim 27, the combination of references teaches the system for providing a network adapter for one or more access points in a LAN environment. Therefore, the cited combination also teaches the *method* for *providing* the network, as presented in claim 27. This claim is rejected under the same rationale.

As for claims 28-33, these correspond to the method for providing the system having the network adapter disclosed in previous claims. The combination of references teaches the corresponding limitations for the system, providing the network adapter and therefore teaches the limitations for the method claimed. Claims 28-33 are rejected under the same basis.

Regarding claim 34, Vaid teaches a *network adapter* (see Figure 1, “108”) for one or more access points in a local area network environment (see [0027] and [0035]). The reference includes means for connecting said one or more access points to a wired network and means for connecting said one or more access points to a wireless network (see [0004], [0023]). Therefore, the reference also teaches the interfaces for communication. In addition, Vaid teaches means for enforcing a managed network environment (see [0044]) and means for communicating with a network control server (see Figure 1).

However, the reference does not explicitly teach, “enforcing a managed network environment, including at least one of filtering and rewriting data packets”, as claimed. Brabenac teaches a network adapter (see Figure 2, “150”) to filter packets received from the network (Id., “160”). The Brabenac disclosure, therefore teaches management capabilities in a network (by filtering packets). In addition, it teaches that the networking device 272 (part of “network adapter 150”) is capable of communicating across network 160 using a TCP/IP (Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol) or UDP/IP (User Datagram Protocol/Internet Protocol) connection (see [0032]). At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to combine the cited disclosures for the reasons stated above.

As for claim 35, Vaid does not teach packet filtering carried out with at least one of security and quality of service policies. Brabenac teaches security in packet filtering (See Abstract). The reference teaches filtering unwanted and potentially dangerous packets

(see [0006]). At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the cited disclosures for the reasons stated above.

9. Claims 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaid [US 2002/0091843 A1] in view of Brabenac [US 2002/0083351 A1] in view of Molitor [US 6,661,799 B1].

As for claims 36-37, the combination of references (Vaid in view of Brabenac) does not teach packet rewriting carried out in accordance with packet rewriting policies of the managed network environment or enabling at least one of a roaming capability and network address translation (NAT). Molitor teaches a NAT device which uses intelligent re-writing of the four source/destination elements within each packet flowing through it, to present to each of the two networks a false but compatible view of the other network's IP addressing scheme (see col. 2, lines 45-58). Network Address Translation (NAT) implements routing rules for converting information on flow source and destination included in packets and addresses. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the cited combination of disclosures in order to obtain a network, which allows applications to request information concerning address translations to be performed, as taught by Molitor (see Abstract).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angel L. Casiano whose telephone number is 571-272-4142. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2182

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alc
19 August 2005



KIM HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/22/05